

alike, in their efforts that they have made to be safe and to have our children safe, there is no refusing to acknowledge that the world knows America through the eyes of Jonesboro, and Pennsylvania and Columbine, and it knows this Nation of laws and of dignity and of respect for the Constitution as a somewhat violent Nation.

It seems appalling that we cannot listen to the majority of Americans who are willing to accept reasonable gun safety laws, such as the legislation that many of us have put forward, in particular I have put forward legislation, that asks for adults to be held responsible if guns get in the hands of children; to support trigger locks; to, in fact, provide a nationwide educational effort that reasonably stays away from politics and begins to tell children about the dangers of guns.

But lo and behold, here we go again, to take a moment when mothers are coming forward as mothers, organized by mothers and organized by respective communities, using the resources of their own, not being propelled by any emotion other than there is too much bloodshed with respect to our children, because more of our children die from homicide and die from guns than any other civilized nation or any other nation, yet the National Rifle Association takes this week, I guess this is their counterproposal, to promote advertisement to suggest that they are prepared to give \$1 million to provide for gun safety in America's schools or to deal with America's children.

Really, what I say to the National Rifle Association and Charlton Heston, and all of those who would propose that they are sincere, is to join the mothers in their march; stand up and actually be seen not as antagonists but a sincere person who believes in gun safety, not the hypocrisy and the outrage of putting on advertisements and to suggest that they have one iota of the slightest concern about passing real gun safety legislation.

For if they did, then they would see the ridiculousness of the gun show loopholes; that anyone, no matter what their background, can walk into the thousands of gun shows unrestricted across America and buy guns. They would understand that that does not violate the second amendment if we simply ask that there be regulations and restrictions on those purchases. It does not interfere with law-abiding citizens who buy guns, it does not interfere with sports enthusiasts, gun collectors, no one who is seriously interested in abiding by the law and holding their guns safely in their homes. And, yes, it does not prohibit anyone from protecting themselves against that intruder, although the statistics show that most gun violence in homes is family to family because the guns are there.

So we are quick to be able to prosecute an 11-year-old boy that tragically

shot another human being, but we do not look to the systemic problem of that little boy's condition and the exposure to guns. And we are appalled when a 6-year-old shoots a 6-year-old, but we do not address the question of the systemic problem of guns in America.

So I applaud the mothers and will be supporting them as a mother myself, and I hope that we will mourn over no more lost and dying babies and children because of guns. And to the National Rifle Association I say, take the ads off and stand up and be counted for something that is real; real gun safety, real support for the stopping of the killing of our babies.

SELF-DEFENSE AND RIGHT-TO-CARRY LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, after the speech by my colleague, I think it is useful to perhaps tone down the rhetoric and bring some statistics and some information from Dr. John Lott, a distinguished scholar at the Yale University Law School, and talk about experts on crime and what they have to say.

Mr. Speaker, I have an article from the Washington Times that is dated April 26 that I will make a part of the RECORD wherein Dr. Lott highlights a number of cases in his article detailing how anti-gun advocates routinely admit facts, figures, and they change statistics to generally develop a misinterpretation of gun ownership in America.

Along with Dr. Lott, a Professor Bill Landes from the University of Chicago has done extensive research on waiting periods, sentencing laws, background checks, and other current gun control laws and they compare those with the effect on deterring so-called "rampage killings." As to their conclusions, Mr. Speaker, I will quote directly from their article:

"While higher arrests and conviction rates, longer prison sentences and the death penalty reduce murders generally, neither these measures nor restrictive gun laws had a discernible impact on mass public shootings. We found only one policy that effectively reduces these attacks: The passage of right-to-carry laws."

Both these professors confirm that law-abiding citizens, possessing a legal right to carry concealed hand guns, had a dramatic impact on multiple victim shootings.

□ 0945

Indeed, these laws, on average, decreased multiple-victim shootings by one-fifth.

Now, in my home State of Florida, they recognized this fact. In 1987, they passed a law to allow law-abiding citizens to carry a licensed, concealed weapon.

What were the results? Florida's homicide rate dropped from 37 percent above the national average to 3 percent below the national average. The decrease in violent offenses involving firearms in Florida continues to decline.

Now, according to the Florida Department of Law Enforcement Uniform Crime Report, in 1989, firearms accounted for 30 percent of all violent offenses. Last year, firearms only accounted for 20 percent of all violent offenses.

Mr. Speaker, 31 States today now have right-to-carry laws and have experienced similar results like Florida.

Dr. Lott's article further highlights the need for individual Americans to be able to defend themselves outside their home.

To address this issue, I developed and introduced legislation, H.R. 492, which is identical to my bill in the 105th Congress which was debated in the House Committee on the Judiciary. My bill establishes a national standard providing for reciprocity in regard to the manner in which nonresidents of a State may carry certain concealed firearms into the State.

Now, in order to carry a concealed firearm across State lines, a person would have to be properly licensed for carrying a concealed weapon in his home State and would have to obey the concealed weapon laws of that State they are entering.

If the State they are entering does not have a concealed weapons law, the national standard provision in this legislation would dictate the rules in which a concealed weapon would have to be maintained. For instance, the national standard would disallow the carrying of a concealed weapon in a school, police station, or a bar serving alcoholic beverages.

My bill also exempts qualified former and current law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns. Now, this language was adopted during debate on the juvenile justice bill last year.

Mr. Speaker, right-to-carry laws are an effective deterrent to these mass killings and random murders. States which have adopted such laws, on the average, have 24 percent less violent crime, 19 percent less homicides, and 39 percent less robberies. These are precisely the type of statistics which gun control supporters refuse to acknowledge.

Yesterday, the President stated that he is "subdued, frustrated, and very saddened" as he reflected on the lack of pending gun control legislation in Congress.

Mr. President, we, too, are frustrated, frustrated that those who seek

to curb gun violence refuse to acknowledge the one effective deterrent, the right to carry.

So, as I stated earlier, the right-to-carry defense should not be confined to State boundaries. A law-abiding citizen legally carrying a concealed firearm in his or her State should be entitled to the same protection in any State.

I urge my colleagues to support my bill.

CORPORATE INVESTMENT IN AUTHORITARIAN REGIMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting time to be in our Nation's capital. There are more chief executive officers, more CEOs, of the country's largest corporations roaming the halls this week and next week than perhaps anytime in recent American political history.

The reason? The United States Congress is considering giving Permanent Most Favored Nation status trading privileges to the People's Republic of China.

When it comes to competing for U.S. trade and investment dollars, democratic countries in the developing world are losing ground to more authoritarian countries in the developing world, like China.

The CEOs that come to our offices and implore us to support permanent trade advantages for the People's Republic of China and its communist regime tell us that China is a lucrative market, with 1.2 billion potential consumers.

What they do not tell us, but what is the most important to them, is that China is a nation of 1.2 billion potential workers, workers who are paid 30 cents an hour, workers who do not talk back, workers who cannot form unions, workers who do not benefit from any worker safety legislation or environmental laws or food safety standards.

In the post-Cold War decade, the share of developing country exports to the U.S. for democratic nations fell from 53 percent to 34 percent, a decrease of 18 percentage points.

American CEOs prefer doing business in totalitarian countries like China because western investors enjoy the benefits of child labor and slave labor and 25-cent-an-hour wages.

In manufacturing goods, developing democracies' share of developing country exports fell 21 percentage points, from 56 to 35 percent. American CEOs prefer doing business in countries like China, authoritarian countries like China, where workers can never speak up, where human rights are dismissed, where worker rights are simply nonexistent.

Nations that do not support democracy have gained five percent of U.S. investment over the last 10 years. China was responsible for 95 percent of foreign investment gained for non-democratic countries.

American CEOs prefer doing business in authoritarian nations like China with an obedient, docile workforce that has no ability to organize unions. Western corporations have shown they want to invest in countries that have below poverty wages, poor environmental standards, no opportunities for unions. They love to invest in authoritarian countries that suppress labor rights, allow slave labor, allow child labor, pay 25 cents an hour.

The United States talks a good game about democratic ideals worldwide through all of our trade programs. But, as developing nations make progress toward democracy, something we say we applaud in this institution, the American business community penalizes those countries that are becoming more democratic by pulling its trade and investment in favor of totalitarian countries like China.

CEOs tell us that engaging with China will bring more democracy to that country and more freedom and more enterprise and all of that. But who are the real decision-makers in China? Who gains from the system the way it is in China? Who is in charge in the People's Republic of China?

First, the Chinese Communist Party makes most decisions in that country; second, the People's Liberation Army, which owns many of the export businesses in China, the big manufacturing concerns; and third, the western investors are very influential that have businesses set up in China.

Which of those groups wants to see change? Which of those groups wants China to democratize? Which of those groups wants workers in that country to have more rights, to have more ability to speak up, to be able to form unions and bargain collectively and bring their wages up? The Chinese Communist Party? I do not think so. The People's Liberation Army? I do not think so. Western investors in China? I do not think so.

Those three groups, the Chinese Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army, western investors, lump them all together and they are all aiming for the same thing. They like doing business. They like the synergism that results when the three of them work together. They like the way things are in the People's Republic of China.

That is why we should vote "no" on Permanent Most Favored Nation status for China.

Shame on us, shame on this Congress if we give Permanent Most Favored Nation status trading privileges to the People's Republic of China, a communist government that flies in the face of all human rights, that cares

nothing about its workers, that exploits child labor, slave labor, that persecutes Christians, allows and encourages forced abortion. Shame on us in this Congress if we give Permanent Most Favored Nation status to that country.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Prophets of old longed to see Your Salvation, O God. They investigated the times You revealed Yourself in history.

They searched for words to describe Your encounter. It was Your Spirit who gave meaning to suffering and brought forth rejoicing in the glories of humanity.

For decades historians have been unwinding the story of this Nation as the wisdom of its founders is taken to heart.

Immigrants and natives have toiled to fulfill its secret promise; parents still dream and plant hopes in their children.

Help us, ever-revealing God, to see with prophetic vision; to realize in our own day America's promise; and to bring to the rest of the world, respect for law, the sanctity of life, and the joy of freedom.

For You live in our midst now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PASCRELL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PASCRELL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.